

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1538th
MEETING

Tuesday, 28 November 1967,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 91:	
Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (<i>concluded</i>)	
Consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2 (<i>concluded</i>)	1

Chairman: Mr. Ismail FAHMY
(United Arab Republic).

AGENDA ITEM 91

Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (*concluded*)* (A/6663, A/6676 and Add.1-4; A/C.1/946; A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION
A/C.1/L.406/REV.2 (*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN: As previously agreed, the Committee will resume discussion on the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America [A/C.1/946], in particular the revised draft resolution submitted by the Latin American countries and contained in document A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2. Before putting this to the vote, I will call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

2. Mr. BRAITHWAITE (Guyana): First of all, I want to express my delegation's and my country's deep appreciation of the time afforded by the Chair for further consideration of the draft resolution now before us.

3. On 17 November [1531st meeting], in speaking on the first revision of this draft resolution [A/C.1/L.406/Rev.1], my delegation raised an issue of principle. At issue was, and remains, that this Committee and the United Nations as a whole should not be called upon to "welcome with special satisfaction" a Treaty which in its articles is discriminatory on a matter whose very essence demands the fullest expression of universality called for in the Charter of the United Nations.

4. It is a matter of deep and singular regret to my delegation and to my Government that the co-sponsors of this Treaty found themselves unable to accept our proposal that the principle of universal application be dealt with in an operative paragraph—and dealt with in a manner which would have expressed a resolve to remedy this grave defect in a treaty which, in many other ways, is so noble and human an expression of aspiration and intent.

5. The argument was advanced against my delegation's proposal that such an operative paragraph would have called for a change in a Treaty upon which the resolution's co-sponsors had already placed their stamp of approval, and that the co-sponsors as signatories to the Treaty could not, in their resolution, call for a change in its text. But a resolution, once it is adopted by this Committee, ceases to be the sole responsibility of its sponsors and co-sponsors; it becomes instead a resolution adopted by the First Committee and recommended for adoption by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

6. Surely it was not too much to have asked, in considering a resolution such as the one before us—a resolution so specifically linked to action taken outside this world Organization—that this Committee, in its consideration, should have had freedom not only to praise and commend but to point out inconsistencies and call for their correction. And inconsistencies are there for all to see.

7. While the final paragraph of the preamble to the Treaty [A/C.1/946] declares the fidelity of Latin America to its tradition of universality, the clear intention of article 25 (2) is to exclude my country from participation. It is to exploit the principle of universality that it should be called upon to bear the weight of such a grave contradiction as is imposed by article 25 (2).

8. In making this presentation I am not—I repeat, not—indulging in speculation. The representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Perez Guerrero, has more than once explicitly reinforced the argument I have just presented. He has made it clear that as far as Venezuela is concerned they worked assiduously to ensure that the discriminatory clauses about which we complained were inserted in the Treaty. He has said this without reservation—and I say this knowing that he is present and listening to me.

9. The contradictions have multiplied within recent days. A few days ago my delegation was advised that under what has been called a new interpretation of article 25 it would appear that Guyana can in fact become a signatory to this Treaty. When this new interpretation, so called, was advanced I challenged the representative of Venezuela as to his view of it. Again, and publicly, he reiterated that should Guyana allow itself to be persuaded to sign the Treaty, his Government would, at the right time and in the right place, take every step within its power to invalidate that signature. I am not speculating. I am stating a fact. The representative of Venezuela is here: if I say anything that is not true he knows he can refute this completely.

10. My delegation considered advice about this supposed new interpretation with the care and thoroughness warranted by so serious a proposal, but we found ourselves

* Resumed from the 1535th meeting.

faced with egregious confusion occasioned by a flaw in legal draftsmanship.

11. In the discriminatory article 25, superimposed upon the clear intention to exclude Guyana from participation, there is a legal loophole occasioned by a misplaced semicolon. Here I ought to say, and say clearly, that Guyana is reading the Treaty as presented. We did not draft the Treaty: we are forced to read the text as it is.

12. My Government's inability to accept this new and unexpected interpretation of article 25 is based on our certain knowledge of the intention of the Treaty's drafters, and it is with a view to clarifying that intention that I should like briefly to examine the events preceding the recent advice that Guyana may now qualify for signature.

13. Guyana has already, within the recent past, been confronted with exclusion at the regional level on grounds essentially similar to the provisions of article 25 (2). It would be difficult to over-emphasize my Government's concern when presented in this Treaty with evidence of the intention that Guyana, once again and for reasons so irrelevant to the Treaty's purpose, should be excluded from participation in a regional endeavour.

14. My Government, aware of the possibility of an interpretation of article 25 such as that suggested a few days ago, but equally aware of the exclusionary intention, initially sought clarification of the issue in exploratory discussions. In so doing, my Government was conscious of the possibility that the formulation employed in article 25 (1)(b) might not in fact reflect the true intention of its drafters. We were prepared to give them the benefit of the doubt. Indeed, in our discussions we were advised that the intention was clear—that in fact Guyana was intended to be excluded under the provisions of article 25 (2). In addition, the documents of the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America which are available to us, and in which my country is referred to by name, expressly confirmed this intention. For those who are interested, the reference is COPREDAL/AR/31, dated 11 May 1966, page 6.

15. My Government was thus given the prevailing interpretation of the exclusionary provisions: this was that the strict meaning of the article was not capable of application and that the intention to exclude Guyana would be upheld.

16. In our general statement to the Assembly, my Minister of State tested this interpretation of the intention of article 25 (2) when he said [*1581st plenary meeting*] that it was a matter of deep regret and concern to his Government that, by virtue of the exclusionary provisions of article 25 of the Treaty, Guyana was precluded from being a signatory.

17. Since then, in discussions with the co-sponsors of this draft resolution, my delegation has, time and again, advanced the prevailing interpretation of this article, only to have it confirmed by the response that Guyana, though unable to be a signatory, might nonetheless wish to make a unilateral declaration accepting the obligations of a contracting party to the Treaty. In short, it would seem that although Guyana is a sovereign State it is denied the right of association with this Treaty in terms not dissimilar from other sovereign States.

18. Against this background it is now suggested that Guyana is in fact eligible to sign this Treaty. This new interpretation calls into question our good faith and imposes on my delegation the obligation to explain why the verbal assurances of our Latin American brothers and colleagues to this effect cannot satisfy the expectations of our Government. The present position of our Government rests on a detailed examination of article 25 of this Treaty.

19. Article 25 distinguishes between four categories of States—a categorization which suggests an order or priority corresponding to the cultural antecedents of the countries concerned. Article 25 (1)(a) allows the Latin American States of the region to sign this Treaty unconditionally. Article 25 (1)(b) opens this Treaty for signature to all sovereign States, other than Latin American States situated in their entirety south of latitude 35° north in the western hemisphere. This sub-paragraph also opens this Treaty to signature by dependent Territories in the same area when they have been admitted by the General Conference. Finally, the Treaty is open to signature by political entities, part or all of whose territories is the subject of a claim or dispute between an extra-continental country and one or more Latin American countries.

20. It is specifically provided in article 25 (2), however, that the General Conference shall take no decision regarding the admission of the last-mentioned category of States, unless such dispute or claim has been settled by peaceful means. It is not accidentally that I draw this to your attention, because so much is being said about Guyana's freedom to become a signatory that it is necessary that this paragraph be thoroughly understood.

21. On a strict interpretation of article 25 (1)(b), it would appear that Guyana can become a signatory to this Treaty, since it is among those "sovereign States situated in their entirety south of latitude 35° north in the western hemisphere". It is equally clear, however, that since Guyana is, under article 25 (2), "a political entity part . . . of whose territory is the subject, prior to the date when this Treaty is opened for signature, of a dispute or claim between an extra-continental country and one or more Latin American States", it is precluded by the provisions of this article from becoming a signatory to this Treaty.

22. What my Government is now faced with is a contradiction occasioned by an error in draftsmanship. For while article 25 (1)(b) allows Guyana, by necessary inference, to become a signatory to this Treaty, article 25 (2), by equally inescapable inference, precludes Guyana from signing. Postulated in other terms, on the one hand, inference unsupported by a declaration of intent favourable to Guyana's admission to signature supports our becoming a signatory, whereas, on the other hand, inference supported by a clear statement of intent in the *travaux préparatoires* of the Preparatory Commission which met in Mexico City to draft that Treaty precludes Guyana from becoming a signatory.

23. It was with the object of achieving some clarification of the conflicting intention of the drafters of this Treaty that my Government tried to elicit from our Latin American colleagues a public commitment before this Committee regarding Guyana's competence to sign this Treaty.

24. My delegation has now been told, in informal discussions, that the States of Latin America would raise no objection to Guyana becoming a signatory to this Treaty. We have so far failed, however, to have that commitment made in a form that would operate at some future point in time to preclude any State of Latin America from challenging in a competent international tribunal the validity of Guyana's signature. The failure of my Government to get this type of commitment is seminal to the understanding of my delegation's present position.

25. The representative of Venezuela, whose candour and forthrightness my delegation cannot fail to applaud and appreciate, has indicated in unequivocal terms that his Government will challenge in the proper forum the validity of Guyana's signature. It needs no arguing that, in the event that Guyana's competence to sign this Treaty is challenged in a competent forum, nothing will be in existence by way of an admission which would serve to support the validity of our signature. In point of fact, a competent tribunal, on examining the *travaux préparatoires* of the Preparatory Commission which met in Mexico City, will be hard put to find an intention contrary to the one expressed in article 25 (2). As I have noted earlier in this statement, the express intention that Guyana should be excluded under article 25 (2) is recorded in the preparatory documents and has since been unequivocally substantiated by the representative of Venezuela.

26. But in considering the implications of the exclusion effected under article 25 (2), further inconsistencies arise. One lies in leaving territory open within the region to the "testing, use, manufacture, production, or acquisition . . . of . . . nuclear weapons" (article 1 (1)(a)) and for the "receipt, storage, installation" and "deployment" of such weapons (article 1 (1)(b))—and all of this in a Treaty whose purpose is the creation of a nuclear-free zone.

27. In addition, it is to argue a strange logic that, while article 25 invites the signature of States whose international relations are such that the resort to nuclear weapons as a means of settling any existing or potential dispute is the remotest of possibilities, it excludes from signature political entities whose territories are the subject of dispute between a Latin American country and an extra-continental country when that extra-continental country is known to be a major nuclear Power. The presence in the Treaty of Additional Protocol I serves only to emphasize the inconsistency which arises from the exclusions intended under article 25 (2).

28. It is to argue an even stranger logic that peaceful settlement of such disputes should be a condition precedent to signature at all. One would have thought that the exclusion of any State unable to settle a dispute by peaceful means leaves open the question of means which are not those of peace—means which in such a case would in no way be restricted by the sanctions which the Treaty seeks to impose.

29. A treaty for the denuclearization of any area should be open to signature by all States and territories within the area defined. It should be comprehensive in terms of regional participation. Where this is not the case, where motives extraneous to the establishment of a nuclear-free zone have been introduced into the text, then the cause of peace is gravely compromised.

30. This Treaty which the Committee is called upon to welcome in the draft resolution before us is the first of its kind. In many ways it will undoubtedly set a precedent for the future, as many delegations have pointed out. But can this Committee—through unreserved approval of this draft resolution—in good conscience set its seal upon a Treaty for a nuclear-free zone which, *inter alia*, will establish a precedent for discrimination against a State on grounds which are irrelevant to denuclearization?

31. In our inability to accept the additional preambular paragraph put forward by the co-sponsors as hoping to meet our request that the issue of exclusion—the issue of discrimination—be confronted and not evaded; in our inability to accept without any commitment as to the future the recent assurances that our country is eligible to sign this Treaty, my delegation has rested, and continues to rest, its case primarily on the principle of universality—a principle to which this Organization is dedicated, and which should have formed the cornerstone for a treaty such as this. The exclusionary article is still present in the Treaty. It discriminates not only against Guyana, but it will discriminate in the same way against a territory, similarly placed but not yet sovereign, as it moves forward to independence.

32. It is in the light of the discriminatory and exclusionary provisions of article 25 that my delegation maintains that this Organization should not be called upon to endorse this Treaty by way of approving the draft resolution now before us. My delegation must point out that the General Assembly in resolution 1911 (XVIII) expressed the hope that in achieving the aims set out in the declaration on the Denuclearization of Latin America, which was issued on 29 April 1963, "... the States of Latin America will initiate studies, as they deem appropriate, in the light of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations . . .". My delegation submits that this Treaty as it now stands ignores this recommendation of the General Assembly.

33. The argument has been advanced in explanation of this circumstance that this draft resolution does not in fact seek the Treaty's endorsement from the General Assembly. It has been stated also that the General Assembly is not competent to deal with any inconsistencies in this Treaty. It has been urged that this draft resolution seeks only to inform the General Assembly of action taken pursuant to resolution 1911 (XVIII). If this is so, then my delegation submits that the draft resolution before us should be formulated in terms which would require the General Assembly simply to take note of the Treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America. We are convinced that a draft resolution phrased in such terms would gain the unanimous approval of this Committee of the General Assembly.

34. As it now stands my delegation cannot support this draft resolution, for behind the resolution stands a Treaty which is, inescapably, coloured by discrimination, which is coloured by exclusion, a Treaty which breaches the principle of universality and in so breaching distorts the noble purpose its signatories set out to achieve. In view only of our respect for the fundamental objectives of the co-sponsors, my delegation will abstain when this resolution is put to the vote.

35. The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker, with the permission of the Committee I should like to say a

few words. Members of the Committee are fully aware that we had a very extensive discussion on this item. There were, likewise, very elaborate consultations informally between the co-sponsors and the interested parties together with other members of this Committee. Moreover, the Committee has agreed three times to postpone the voting on the revised draft and I feel that the time has come to conclude this item. Members of the Committee know very well that we are acting now in accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure which reads as follows:

"After the Chairman has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting. The Chairman may permit members to explain their votes, either before or after the voting, except when the vote is taken by secret ballot. The Chairman may limit the time to be allowed for such explanations. The Chairman shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment."

36. In accordance with this rule and, in particular, with that part of that rule which says that the Chairman may limit the time to be allowed for such explanations of vote, and in view of the fact that I have a very long list of speakers before the voting, with your permission I propose that we should agree to limit the explanations of vote to five minutes for each delegation. If there is no objection it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

37. The CHAIRMAN: If the delegations who are listed to explain their votes will agree, I shall give the floor to the representative of Venezuela to exercise his right of reply. Before we proceed with the explanation of vote I shall be glad to give him the floor on the basis that this should not be regarded as a precedent which may tempt other representatives to exercise their rights of reply, or we would then find ourselves in a very long chain reaction to every statement which may be made in this connexion. On this understanding I give the floor to the Ambassador of Venezuela to exercise his right of reply.

38. Mr. PEREZ GUERRERO (Venezuela) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, since I am exercising my right of reply, I assume that my statement will not be subject to the five-minute time limit you have set for explanations of vote. Actually, I cannot speak in explanation of my vote, because Venezuela, together with the other signatories of the Treaty of Tlatelolco,¹ is a sponsor of the draft resolution before this Committee [A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2].

39. Moreover, my delegation did not intend to speak again in this debate, since we had already done so in the general debate [1509th meeting] where we set forth our point of view. We agreed with the other countries whose representatives participated in that debate in praising this instrument as an important step of historical significance in the long and difficult process of disarmament. So if I speak now, it is because the representative of Guyana has referred to me

and my country. Therefore, I consider it my duty, not only to my Government, but to all of you who are my colleagues in the First Committee, to explain the thinking of my Government on this subject.

40. Certainly, the problem raised here is important in a relative sense, because it is, in fact, related to the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

41. In my talks with the representative of Guyana, as with all my colleagues of the Latin American group of States, I have always stated my Government's point of view very clearly. Moreover, it is well known to all my colleagues of that group, since Venezuela, together with other Latin American countries, has had occasion to discuss this situation in the Latin American context, in our regional assemblies, where it is more appropriate to do so.

42. We in Venezuela have nothing to hide on this subject, which involves situations inherited from the colonial system, and there are many here whose countries are familiar with the unjust situations which the colonial processes unfortunately all too often left behind them. Latin America is no exception. We in Latin America have decided that these situations must be eliminated, that they must not be allowed to be perpetuated, because injustice must not be perpetuated. Therefore, within the hemisphere's regional system we have established a principle whereby a State with a territorial dispute pending as a consequence of situations deriving from the colonial system cannot become part of this regional system—as in the case of the Organization of American States—until that situation or dispute is settled by peaceful means.

43. I believe that this is the least a Government which has been a victim of the past procedures of colonial Powers can ask, without in the slightest undermining its position in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter or with the principles of the Charter of the Organization of American States which, as we know, are practically the same.

44. The unfortunate dispute between my country and Guyana has been indirectly brought up here. However, that is not the only such situation existing in Latin America. It is with these situations in mind, both with regard to OAS itself, through the so-called Act of Washington, and to the case now before us, that this concept has been included.

45. We have no interest in permanently excluding a country like Guyana which, as we know, is also a peace-loving country, from such a treaty, or from the Organization of American States, or from any other legal instrument. On the contrary, we have stated that our guiding rule is universality. This very point was confirmed with regard to that Treaty, not by my delegation but by the representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles, who has been our spokesman here on this question.

46. The Treaty as such is universal in intent, but that universal intent must be realized taking into account situations like the one I have just mentioned.

47. We wished to deal with the concern—which I would call perfectly normal—expressed by the representative of

¹ Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, signed at Tlatelolco, Mexico City.

Guyana as best we could. The representative of Guyana himself has told you that we have spent hours and days seeking a solution to this problem. A few days ago a formula was proposed right here, which we thought would be satisfactory to Guyana. That solution, suggested by the representative of Jamaica, took the form of a preambular paragraph which was introduced in our draft resolution and appears in document A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2. The paragraph affirmed our guiding concept that any State within the zone defined in the Treaty may become a party to it without restriction. But we cannot start to interpret the different articles of the Treaty here because this is not the proper place to do so, and still less to suggest or make changes in its text. I believe everybody here realizes that that is impossible. To use a term I have just heard, it would certainly be a dangerous precedent, not so much to try to change the Treaty, which is quite impossible, but to suggest by means of amendments in our draft any change, any alteration whatever in any of its articles.

48. We are all familiar with the process of negotiation and formulation of a treaty. A treaty is a political, legal instrument embracing many concepts and provisions, not all of which are necessarily accepted in full by the parties concerned. What they do accept, finally, is the instrument as a whole. And if each of the parties is willing now, in this case as in any other, to accept all the articles, it is because a treaty is a self-contained, complete, finished instrument which all the signatories are bound to support. That is the position of the delegation of my country, Venezuela, and, I venture to say, that of the other signatories of the Treaty.

49. Mr. Chairman, as you are well aware from all your experience of the matter, the General Assembly is not called upon to approve the Treaty itself through this draft resolution, as I believe I heard the representative of Guyana say. If that were the case, the General Assembly would be going beyond what we ourselves have asked, and we by no means intend to ask the General Assembly to act outside of its competence. To be able to do that, if it were necessary, we would naturally have had to scrutinize each of its provisions and would virtually have had to engage here, once again, in the same process of negotiation. That would be tantamount to renegotiating a treaty in a sphere completely extraneous to it, since, in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty, only a few of the Powers represented here which are not signatories will accede to it; and those are the nuclear Powers and any others having any territory, whether *de facto* or *de jure*, within the area defined in the text of the Treaty.

50. Therefore, I really cannot see how anyone can say that an article affecting a situation originating in the past and which must be settled by peaceful means can in any way raise doubts concerning a treaty which includes universally accepted principles and procedures and which has received widespread, practically unanimous praise from all those who have spoken during this debate.

51. In response to your appeal, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to prolong this debate more than necessary. It is not for the delegation of Venezuela to defend the Treaty as a whole at this time, since that has already been done. What I wish to do is to state very clearly that Venezuela is confronted here by a situation it considers of vital

importance. We regret that it is our good neighbour Guyana that confronts us with this situation created by historical reasons beyond its control, namely, the fact that Guyana inherited a situation deriving from the colonial rule to which it was subjected until very recently.

52. I should like all the representatives in the General Assembly and in this First Committee to ponder these facts. We have been asked to do something which is both theoretically and practically impossible. We have gone as far as we could, making our intentions very clear. So far as Venezuela is concerned, we can go no further.

53. I do not wish to interpret the views of my companions and colleagues of the Latin American group here, nor to speak on their behalf. It is for each of them to explain his own position. But I am sure the signatories of the Treaty agree with Venezuela that we cannot accept any suggestion that any of its articles be changed, including the one discussed this afternoon in this Committee.

54. Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (*translated from French*): The Belgian delegation would like to associate itself with the many expressions of admiration for the efforts made by the Latin American countries to have nuclear weapons banned from their continent, and of satisfaction at seeing the successful culmination of those efforts in the signing of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

55. The general debate on the question and the new discussions which have just taken place have brought out not only the great complexity of the problems that have had to be faced, but also certain differences of interpretation still outstanding and certain gaps that remain to be filled.

56. The successive revisions of the draft resolution are an assurance that the political will and the legal acumen of the signatory countries will produce brilliant solutions to these very tricky problems.

57. Moreover, in spite of the differences of interpretation and unfortunate gaps, the Belgian delegation welcomes the conclusion of the Treaty as a significant contribution to disarmament and peace.

58. Belgium is neither a nuclear Power nor an administering Power in respect of any territory in that part of the world; hence it is not directly affected by the Additional Protocols to the Treaty. We nevertheless express the hope that the Powers concerned will be able to follow the example of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, which have promised to subscribe to them. Looked at in that way, the draft resolution amounts to an appeal and an act of faith.

59. Finally the Belgian delegation would like to pay a sincere and well-deserved tribute to the head of the Mexican delegation, Mr. García Robles, whose ability and tenacity have triumphed over many obstacles to bring the preparation of this historic instrument to fruition.

60. With those things in mind, my delegation will vote in favour of the second revision of the draft resolution of the twenty Latin American Powers.

61. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): I should like to explain the vote of the Czechoslovak delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2.

62. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has stated its definitely favourable attitude towards the idea of the creation of nuclear-free zones in any part of the world during all the discussions on this matter. In 1957 we warmly welcomed the initiative taken by the Polish People's Republic and expressed our willingness to include our territory in the denuclearized zone in Central Europe under the Rapacki Plan. Our position is based on the conviction that the creation of denuclearized zones would be an important step towards a relaxation of tension in the world and the achievement of general and complete disarmament.

63. Therefore, it is with greatest sympathy that we have followed the efforts of the countries of Latin America to carry through the idea of the creation of a continent free of nuclear weapons, and we should like to join those delegations that have expressed such high appreciation of the great work accomplished by the Latin American States, above all by Mexico, which has resulted in the first Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in a specific geographical area. At the same time, we should like to join with those who believe that this example will exert a favourable influence on and strengthen the efforts to create nuclear-free zones in other parts of the world as well.

64. Therefore, we hope that our point of view on certain provisions of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America will be correctly understood, since we think it important to have certain ambiguous provisions cleared up, particularly from the point of view of future negotiations on the creation of other nuclear-free zones and on other measures in the field of nuclear disarmament.

65. First of all, I should like to note that the fact that the United States of America, as a nuclear Power, refused to subject its military bases in Latin America to the provisions of the Treaty, significantly weakens its implementation. Further, it should be remembered that the United States still unlawfully maintains its military base in Guantanamo, against the will of people and the Government of the Republic of Cuba.

66. The question of the transportation of nuclear weapons through territories covered by the Treaty and that of the geographical scope of the Treaty, which goes considerably beyond the territorial waters of the participants, still remains unclear.

67. Further, I should like to say that the discussion in the Committee unfortunately did not dispel but rather strengthened our fears that article 18 of the Treaty permits of so wide an interpretation that when the article is applied some of the consequences of that application may work not only against the main objectives of the Treaty, but also against the aim of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

68. The point of view of the Czechoslovak People's Republic on the use of nuclear explosions for peaceful

purposes has been stated clearly by the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in the discussion on a treaty on non-proliferation in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. I should like to recall what we said:

"... the Czechoslovak delegation regards it as necessary that the question of the manufacture of nuclear explosives for such purposes should be covered by the non-dissemination treaty fully and without reservation. A number of delegations have already adduced indisputable facts testifying to the necessity of such a solution. The crux of the problem lies in the fact that from the technological point of view any State manufacturing nuclear explosives at the same time manufactures nuclear weapons, whether wittingly or not.

"At the same time we wish to stress that we do not regard such a solution as an obstacle to a potential use of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes by the non-nuclear-weapon State."²

69. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, which does not possess nuclear weapons, is interested, just as other non-nuclear States, in the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and in broad international co-operation in that area. However, at the same time and for these very reasons it is in favour of the speedy conclusion of an effective treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which would bar the way to non-dissemination of nuclear weapons in any form.

70. The existing ambiguities in regard to nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes in the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, together with certain other ambiguities which I have mentioned, do not allow us to vote in favour of resolution A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2.

71. The Czechoslovak delegation will therefore abstain in the vote, but it would repeat that it supports the main purposes and principles expressed and confirmed in this Treaty.

72. U SOE TIN (Burma): The delegation of Burma supports the draft resolution on the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America presented by Mexico on behalf of itself and nineteen other Latin American delegations. The co-sponsors of the draft resolution, who also are the States signatories to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, have on their own initiative and with commendable foresight and untiring efforts and nerve-breaking patience, steered themselves clear through difficult and complex negotiations not only among themselves but also with the nuclear Powers, and successfully concluded this Treaty which is now commonly known as the Treaty of Tlatelolco. They have come forward to this forum of world organization and have explained in the most comprehensive and lucid manner, and in no uncertain terms, the significance and scope of the provisions of the Treaty. They have manifested to the world at large how it is possible through understanding, goodwill and co-operation among the developing countries to achieve such an important agreement on the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America, which represents a far-reaching and progressive step towards the non-proliferation of

² Document ENDC/PV.316, paras. 16 and 17.

nuclear weapons and our ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

73. It is therefore a matter of special satisfaction and profound gratification to us here that this important Treaty has been so profusely welcomed and favourably commented upon, and tributes deservedly paid to the architects and signatories of the Treaty in such numbers and with such warmth both within and outside this Organization. The Treaty has been widely hailed as a "unique achievement", as one which "marks an important milestone on the road to disarmament", as providing for "the creation, for the first time in history, of a nuclear free zone in an inhabited part of the earth" and as setting "an example and stimulant for progress in other disarmament measures of world-wide as well as of regional significance."

74. The provisions of the Treaty also embody the principle of an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers, a principle established in the United Nations General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX). The Treaty has also evoked the appreciation of all the developing nations in that while prohibiting and preventing the testing, use, manufacture, production or acquisition of nuclear weapons, thus sparing their peoples from the squandering of their limited resources on nuclear armaments and protecting them against possible nuclear attacks, it provides and encourages the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in the promotion of economic and social development for the betterment of humanity. This Treaty has thus provided a very important stimulant and created a welcome psychological climate for the conclusion of a world-wide Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

75. The dangers to world peace inherent in the spread of nuclear weapons has been a matter of general concern all over the world. Burma shares the general concern and anxiety to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons and has consistently supported all efforts made in this direction both in the United Nations General Assembly and the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva. We would accordingly welcome with deep satisfaction the present achievement by our Latin America colleagues in concluding this Treaty which constitutes an event of historic significance in our efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and promote international peace and security.

76. A sincere and unique attempt has been made by the States signatories to the Latin American Treaty to free their innocent countrymen and eventually the whole of mankind from the tyranny of nuclear armaments, especially from the never-ending nightmare of a sudden and terrible end in a nuclear holocaust. We feel it our bounden duty to give our wholehearted support and co-operation to ensure that the régime laid down in the Treaty enjoys the universal observance to which its lofty principles and noble aims entitle it.

77. The delegation of Burma will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution. In according its support to the draft resolution, my delegation is not unmindful of the provisions of preambular paragraph 6 of the revised draft, and of

article 25, paragraph 2, of the Treaty. It is our firm belief that the Latin American countries involved will be able to solve matters amicably given sufficient time and opportunity and thus permit the present Treaty to become applicable to all States within the area.

78. Mr. KULAGA (Poland) (*translated from French*): In speaking in the general debate on the question of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, the Polish delegation took particular account of the intention of the authors of the Treaty and the request that this question should be included in the agenda in the form of an item for information only.

79. Hence, in our statement we dealt with the matter from the point of view of the idea of denuclearization, in which we have a special interest for reasons well known to all the members of this Committee.

80. We were anxious to express our satisfaction at finding that this concept had inspired the authors of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We continue to give our full support to the proposals for denuclearization, which we fervently hope to see fully realized in different parts of the world. We did not, however, make a detailed study of the Treaty. Speaking of its implications, we merely singled out certain facts which we felt influenced the terms of the Treaty, in particular the question of transit of nuclear weapons and that of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

81. We also referred to the question of the geographical boundaries of the zone, which leave the American bases in Latin America outside the field of application of the Treaty, thus substantially reducing the military significance the Treaty might have had and making it impossible for all the States in the region to accede to the Treaty.

82. For these reasons my delegation will abstain in the vote on the twenty-Power draft resolution, which in our view touches on the substance of a question which we are not competent to deal with, which we have not examined in detail, and certain basic aspects of which give rise to the misgivings I have just mentioned.

83. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria): The Austrian delegation will support the draft resolution presented to us by twenty Latin American countries, and we welcome with satisfaction the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

84. As we have regretfully come to realize that our hope for an early agreement on general and complete disarmament will not be fulfilled in the foreseeable future, the Austrian delegation considers it all the more important that we should concentrate on partial measures of disarmament in those areas where agreement can be achieved. In this respect we were encouraged by the conclusion in 1959 of the Antarctic Treaty and in 1963 of the Partial Test-Ban Treaty.³ Last year it was possible to reach agreement on a Treaty on Principles governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space including the

³ Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed in Moscow on 5 August 1963 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1964), No. 6964).

Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [*General Assembly resolution 2222 (XXI)*]. That Treaty, which entered into force a few weeks ago, contains important provisions limiting the armaments race in outer space. The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which twenty-one Latin American States signed earlier this year in Mexico, will be an important further step in the endeavour to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

85. We wish to pay tribute to the delegation of Mexico and to its Chairman, Mr. García Robles, who contributed so much to the successful conclusion of the Treaty.

86. Austria, which as you will recall, in 1955 accepted the contractual obligation not to possess, construct or experiment with any atomic weapon, welcomes with great satisfaction this decision by the nations of Latin America. We recognize the importance of establishing for the first time a nuclear-free zone in a large inhabited area of the world and its contribution to the stability, security and peace in that area and, indeed, in the world. We also consider it of special significance that this will be the first treaty which has established an agreed system of verification and control under a permanent supervisory organ, including the full application of the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna. It may thus serve as a valuable precedent for further efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

87. We wish to express our hope, therefore, that the Treaty, through the co-operation of all countries involved, will soon enter into force and that all nations of Latin America, without exception, will be able to become parties to that Treaty. We had hoped that the efforts undertaken by our Latin American friends would have led to a resolution that would have satisfied all points of view, in particular the concern expressed here by the representative of Guyana. Unfortunately, this has apparently not been possible. My delegation sincerely hopes that the existing difficulties in this respect will be overcome and that the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America will truly become a treaty for all nations of Latin America in keeping with the high ideals and noble objectives of this Treaty.

88. In the light of these considerations, the Austrian delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted to this Committee.

89. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): In explanation of our vote, I should like briefly to put on record our position on the subject before us.

90. The Hungarian Government has always attached great importance to the question of creating nuclear-free zones in different parts of the world. We firmly believe that efforts in this direction, if successfully realized, would not only benefit the peoples of the region concerned but would contribute also to a lessening of international tension in general, thereby promoting peace and understanding among nations on a world-wide scale. With the aggressive war of the United States in Viet-Nam and the continued Israeli aggression in the Middle East, with grave international problems in Europe and elsewhere, such peace efforts as the creation of nuclear-free zones are perhaps more timely than ever.

91. It is in this spirit that the Hungarian delegation welcomed the initiative of a number of Latin American countries to place this item on our agenda. I wish to emphasize our sincere appreciation of their desire to turn this region into a zone of peace, free from the deadly shadow of nuclear catastrophe. It is precisely because of the historic importance of this significant endeavour that we, as a member of the international community, feel concerned about some aspects of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

92. First, I would mention the question of universality. It must be obvious to all that an international undertaking of this kind should be as comprehensive as possible so as to ensure its real effectiveness. It is a fact that the United States, the only nuclear Power of the American continent, is not a party to it. It is also a fact that the Panama Canal Zone, the territory of Puerto Rico and other United States possessions in the area, namely, its military bases, do not fall within the competence of the Treaty. We take note particularly of the fact that Washington has shown no sign whatever of its intention to dismantle the naval base at Guantanamo, in defiance of the repeatedly expressed will of the people and Government of Cuba. Therefore, we fully understand and support the position of the Government of Cuba with regard to the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

93. Our attention has also been drawn by the fact that Guyana, a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, has virtually been excluded from this treaty despite some verbal assertions to the contrary. We have listened with great interest to the statements made in this respect by the representatives of Guyana, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and other Latin American countries, both during the general debate at this session of the Assembly and during deliberations earlier and today in this Committee. Furthermore, we cannot ignore all the dependent Territories in the area which are excluded from the scope of the Treaty, thus greatly reducing its universal efficiency.

94. Secondly, the Treaty does not contain provisions forbidding the passage of nuclear weapons. Evidently, such a deficiency might put the contracting parties into an awkward position in times of crisis, and it does not help to strengthen the image of a truly effective zone, free of nuclear weapons.

95. Thirdly, the Treaty, by permitting nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes—which, from a technical point of view and in essence, do not differ from those carried out for military purposes—provides, theoretically at least, a loophole that can in no way generate confidence in the effectiveness of the Treaty.

96. Lastly, may I be permitted to make a final observation. We take note of a discrepancy between certain operative paragraphs of the draft resolution and the intention of the sponsors expressed in the explanatory memorandum on the agenda item [*A/6676 and Add.1-4*] and in the brilliant exposé of Ambassador García Robles when introducing this item to our Committee [*1504th meeting*]. As we understood it, this item was meant to be of a purely informative character, while the draft resolution before us contains provisions for action to be taken by some other members of the international community in this respect. It would have been more helpful to have clarified these matters right at the very beginning.

97. On the basis of our reservations on certain substantial aspects of the treaty of Tlatelolco, while fully sympathetic to the peaceful intentions and motives that inspired the Latin American States in concluding it, my delegation will be compelled to abstain when it comes to voting.

98. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana): In my intervention in the general debate on this item, I conveyed my Government's congratulations to the Latin American countries for their efforts and foresight in concluding the Treaty for the denuclearization of Latin America. I particularly underscored the usefulness of this Treaty as an important step in the direction of disarmament and as an example to other regions, like Africa, where the Organization of African Unity has adopted a resolution declaring Africa a denuclearized zone.⁴

99. My delegation still stands by those expressions and congratulations and is still convinced of the far-reaching importance of the signing of the Treaty for the denuclearization of Latin America. But in praising the signing of this Treaty we were aware of certain unsatisfactory provisions—provisions of discrimination and exclusion which militated against the very aims, purposes and effectiveness of the Treaty. We were hopeful, however, that all the countries in the area of Latin America would be able to enter into *pourparlers* to resolve this particular problem.

100. The draft resolution now before us, in its first operative paragraph, would have us welcome with special satisfaction the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. I have to emphasize the words "welcome with special satisfaction". There are some who feel—and my delegation is among this group—that the Treaty itself is a matter primarily for the Latin American countries and we are probably not qualified to meddle in its provisions. But in this particular case the Treaty has been submitted to a United Nations body to endorse it and to welcome it with special satisfaction. It is here that we cannot but express our candid opinion; and consequently any implication that we are meddling in a matter which touches Latin America exclusively cannot be justified or tolerated.

101. As my delegation understands it, the problem resulting in the exclusion of certain countries in Latin America from signing the Treaty arises from certain border disputes. In the case of Guyana, particularly, which voiced its complaint before this Committee, we observe that they were mere inheritors of this problem from the United Kingdom, which was the erstwhile colonial Power. But even the United Kingdom which, as it were, created this problem, has been invited by the terms of the Treaty to sign the relevant Protocol, and we have heard the representative of the United Kingdom announce in this Committee [*1508th meeting*] the decision of his Government to sign it in the immediate future. My delegation therefore finds it difficult, indeed curious, that Guyana should suffer for something which, after all, was not of its own doing. Whether or not this is so the continued silence of the United Kingdom delegation on this issue can at best only be regarded as surprising. What is even more important to my

delegation is that the exclusion of Guyana and others in the area from being parties to the Treaty vitiates the whole purport of the Treaty and makes it somewhat ineffective. I hope that Guyana has no intention of allowing the stationing of nuclear weapons on its territory. But is not Guyana by its exclusion being absolved from all responsibility to refrain from introducing nuclear weapons on its territory?

102. My delegation deeply regrets that it has not been found possible to include in the draft resolution before us provisions which would set in train the movements to review these exclusionary provisions in the Treaty.

103. We observe that an additional preambular paragraph has been inserted, stating simply:

"*Noting* that it is the intent of the signatory States that all existing States within the zone defined in the Treaty may become parties to it without any restriction".

I am afraid this does not advance a solution of the problem one bit.

104. I must say in passing that there are many countries in Africa which have serious border and territorial problems, but this has not been used—indeed it cannot be used—to exclude them from participation in the Organization of African Unity nor in any collective undertakings by that Organization. My delegation finds it difficult, therefore, to welcome with special satisfaction a treaty which for its very purposes should be of universal application to the area it is intended to cover, but which unfortunately is discriminatory. We are therefore unable to give the draft resolution, as it stands, the full support we would have wished and will therefore have to abstain.

105. We must decide to which of two objectives we wish to accord greater priority—whether the prevention of nuclear accident and annihilation or the settlement of border disputes. We are quite clear in our minds where we stand because in a nuclear holocaust there would be no borders to rectify.

106. My delegation would vote for the draft resolution if it were amended to indicate merely what the Mexican representative in his introductory statement said the Latin Americans intended this General Assembly to do, that is, to take note of the results of their endeavours, purely for information purposes.

107. Mr. BARNETT (Jamaica): The draft resolution upon which the Committee is about to vote is the culmination of action on the agenda item entitled Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. This item was inscribed on the agenda, my delegation believes, for the main purpose of enabling the signatories to explain the meaning and scope of the Treaty to other Members of the United Nations which, at the same time, would have an opportunity to express their own views on it.

108. At the beginning of the general debate on this item, Jamaica was not a signatory to the Treaty. While Jamaica welcomed the Treaty as a regional step in the right direction, it remained convinced that it could not be completely meaningful unless all States in the region were free to become full parties to it. We are still of that view.

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 105, document A/5975.

109. However, in order to demonstrate its acceptance of the main objectives of the Treaty, the Government of Jamaica became a signatory on 26 October 1967. From the point of view of Jamaica, the consultations which have taken place since the end of the general debate on this item did, we believe, accomplish two things. In the first place, my delegation was able to explain its position more fully to the co-sponsors, who at all times gave us a patient hearing in an atmosphere of understanding. In the second place, the co-sponsors now appear to be convinced that the Treaty will accomplish its objectives better if no State in the zone is excluded from participating in it. This is at least partially included in the penultimate paragraph of the draft resolution.

110. Though we have reservations about certain aspects of operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of the draft resolution, we shall nonetheless vote for the resolution as a whole. This we shall do in the confident belief that at the earliest possible moment all the parties to the Treaty will, in good faith, take the necessary steps to give it a truly universal character so far as the States in the region are concerned.

111. We pay tribute to the co-sponsors for the efforts they have made to accommodate various reservations concerning this resolution, and we also pay tribute to the Chairman of the Mexican delegation, Ambassador García Robles, whose calm, untiring efforts are well known to us but may not be so well known to other members of this Committee. It has been our good fortune to have him, the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America, try to reconcile the differing views. That he has not been wholly successful is not his fault but is rather due to factors inherent in a political situation.

112. This Treaty is of transcendental importance to peoples of the world. It is a step away from the reckless proliferation of nuclear arms and towards a nuclear-disarmed world. Because of this, Jamaica regrets that the Treaty makes unnecessary exceptions, and looks forward to the day when all the States within the zone covered by the Treaty, without any exception whatever, can become parties to it.

113. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation has carefully studied draft resolution A/C.1/L.406 in its original and revised form. We were guided by our position of principle concerning the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world and also by our understanding of the sincere desire of Mexico and other Latin American countries to create a nuclear-free zone in Latin America.

114. In connexion with the forthcoming vote, we should now like to express our views.

115. The question of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America was raised at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly as a question of a purely informative nature. In the explanatory memorandum accompanying the request of the Latin American delegations for the inclusion of the item entitled "Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America" in the agenda of the General Assembly, it was stated that the aim of this proposal was "that the

representatives of the signatory States may explain in the forum of the world Organization the significance and scope of the provisions of the Treaty" [*document A/6676*].

116. Opening the debate in the First Committee on this matter, the representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles, declared that he considered it necessary to emphasize above all the purpose pursued by the twenty-one Latin American States which requested the inclusion of this item, a purpose which was none other than that set forth in the explanatory memorandum [*1504th meeting*], and he went on to quote the words that had just been spoken by the Soviet delegation about the informative nature of the item submitted to the General Assembly that had been taken from document A/6676.

117. The representative of Mexico went on to say that this item was therefore an item *sui generis* in the sense that it was purely informative in nature.

118. This informative character of the item also determined the nature of our debate. We heard some very detailed and very interesting information given by the signatories of the treaty. Information was gained from answers to questions, and the Soviet delegation was among those that asked questions, and expressed views on various provisions of the Treaty. There were also consultations between delegations, and we should like to say that the Soviet delegation too engaged in consultations for its own information with various parties to the Treaty. In the course of these consultations, which we would point out were friendly, we tried to explain further the questions we had asked and to gain a better understanding of the answers given us by the participants to the Treaty.

119. In the light of all this, of the way the question was presented and the way it was examined in the First Committee, it would seem normal for the debate to end with our taking note of the Treaty and perhaps recommending its study by all States in order to enable them, and more particularly the nuclear Powers, to determine their final positions on this Treaty.

120. The need for further study is quite logical, the more so because the Treaty contains provisions which require further study. The Soviet delegation in its statement made during the general debate, pointed to a whole number of aspects of the Treaty that it considered not sufficiently clear. The participants to the Treaty answered our questions as they best felt they could and as was required of them but, to be quite frank, I must admit that these answers, although they contained important and useful information, which helped us to gain a better understanding of the substance of the matter, did not fully clear up the ambiguities in the Treaty. Yet this is a most important aspect of the whole matter, not only because a Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons in Latin America is important in itself, but also because as has been mentioned today by the representative of Czechoslovakia—and we fully share his views—this Treaty must serve in its way as an example for similar treaties on nuclear-free zones in other parts of the world.

121. However, I repeat, certain ambiguities persist, and this applies particularly to those provisions of the Treaty

which were to meet the demands of General Assembly resolution 2153 A (XXI) on the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, a resolution which particularly stressed the desirability of signing regional agreements to ensure the total absence of nuclear weapons as an essential condition that would fully guarantee the effectiveness of a treaty on the creation of denuclearized zones. But in this Treaty there is a provision concerning peaceful nuclear explosions and the transit of nuclear weapons, which, for the time being at any rate, does not convince us that it guarantees the total absence of nuclear weapons within the area it covers. The question of the reasons for and the consequences of extending the application of this Treaty to wide areas of international waters in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans is likewise unclear.

122. We suppose that other delegations, as seems clear from today's explanations of vote, also have doubts about some points that were not fully explained during the discussions. However, we should like to thank the participants in the Treaty, especially those with whom we had detailed discussions on its contents—and more particularly the delegation of Mexico—for having furnished us with useful additional information which, we hope, will enable us, after further study, to take a final stand on this Treaty later on.

123. In these circumstances, the draft resolution presented to the First Committee which is about to be put to the vote seems to go further than is possible at this time, since not all Powers, and not all nuclear Powers, are clear about all its provisions. This draft resolution already at this stage expresses the final opinion of the United Nations on the Treaty. In paragraph 1 the draft resolution states that the Assembly welcomes the conclusion of the Treaty with special satisfaction, as if everything was quite clear and no further clarification was necessary. What is more, this draft resolution calls upon or recommends to States that are or may become signatories of the Treaty and States mentioned in Additional Protocol I of the Treaty to endeavour to take all measures within their power to ensure that the Treaty speedily obtains the widest application among them. In paragraph 3 there is a clear-cut appeal to the States of the area that have explained to us that they were not able to sign this Treaty. We have in mind particularly the Republic of Cuba which, as was convincingly explained by the representative of Cuba, in view of the maintenance of the American military base in Guantanamo and of the aggressive policy of the United States against Cuba, cannot take part in this Treaty. How then can we recommend that the Republic of Cuba should take part in this Treaty if, for reasons independent of its own volition, it cannot do so? Finally, paragraph 4 of the draft resolution "Invites Powers possessing nuclear weapons to sign and ratify Additional Protocol II of the Treaty as soon as possible". In fact, to vote in favour of a draft resolution containing such a provision would be a kind of moral undertaking on the part of all nuclear States voting for this draft to sign and ratify Additional Protocol II.

124. But we are not ready now to take a final stand, for reasons already given by the Soviet delegation. We do not prejudge our final position, but we stress that, in view of serious ambiguities, we are not ready to take such a stand now.

125. Thus, the draft resolution not only takes note of this agenda item, which is an informative one, but goes much further, demanding final acceptance. In these circumstances it is difficult for us to accept it. Therefore, the Soviet delegation will abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

126. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): As the Committee prepares to take a decision on the draft resolution concerning the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, the Algerian delegation would like to explain its vote.

127. The debate has revealed clearly that there is universal support for Latin America's laudable efforts to conclude the first agreement of its kind—a denuclearization treaty covering virtually the whole of the Latin American continent.

128. The Algerian delegation unreservedly associates itself with the good wishes and congratulations offered in the Committee to those countries—particularly to Mexico, the depositary Government—on the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

129. The support that a non-nuclear country can give must, of course, be seen in its proper context. On the other hand, we note that some nuclear countries have not made their attitude towards the Treaty clear. Furthermore, the People's Republic of China, which today has again been denied the right to resume its proper place in this year's Assembly, is invited to undertake to respect this denuclearization treaty.

130. Finally, the Algerian delegation cannot in any circumstances subscribe, without infringing a basic principle of the Charter of the Organization of African States, to the exclusion of a State from an international instrument merely because its territory is the subject of a dispute or for any other reason.

131. The attitude of the Algerian delegation will be determined by the foregoing considerations.

132. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation in an intervention in the general debate on this item [*1507th meeting*] spoke very highly of the principles enshrined in the Treaty signed in Mexico City. In doing so, we were conscious of the noble principles enshrined in the Treaty, principles which are considered by my delegation, and by many other delegations which have taken part in the debate, to be a clear manifestation of the desire of our Latin American friends to rid their region of the scourge of a possible nuclear holocaust.

133. The position of the Tanzanian delegation regarding the principles embodied in the Treaty remains the same. We continue to laud the Treaty as a step in the right direction, a positive step towards general and complete disarmament, and particularly nuclear disarmament.

134. While lauding the Treaty, my delegation has been quite aware of its many imperfections. But we believe it might be too much to expect a perfect treaty. What impressed us most was the determination of the Latin Americans to achieve the military denuclearization of their region.

135. Because of all these reasons it is quite painful for my delegation to find itself unable to support the draft resolution which would commend the Treaty.

136. My delegation views the serious misgivings explained by the delegation of Guyana as being of great importance, involving a matter of principle. We had hoped at the private consultations, which were quite hectic, that it would have been possible to find a formula to allay the fears of certain delegations, including my own, regarding the discriminatory character of the Treaty stipulated in article 25 of that Treaty signed in Mexico City. We strongly believe that the discriminatory provisions have no place in a treaty like this. Article 25, in the opinion of the Tanzanian delegation, goes contrary to the principle of universality which is so essential if treaties of this nature are to be effective.

137. In expressing our strong reservations on the exclusionary provisions of the Treaty, provisions which prevent our delegation from casting our affirmative vote on the draft resolution before us, my delegation would like to express its admiration and respect to Ambassador García Robles of Mexico who has played an active role in an attempt to bring about a harmonization of views on the draft resolution. It is a matter of sincere regret to my delegation that it has not been possible for the co-sponsors to submit a formula which would assure the Committee of the non-discriminatory nature of the Treaty.

138. In concluding my intervention I wish to say that the Tanzanian delegation affirms that it is fully in agreement with the principles enshrined in the Treaty but we regret, because of its discriminatory character, that we are unable to support the draft resolution before us. We shall therefore abstain on the draft resolution.

139. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): The Ethiopian delegation is acutely aware of the difficulties which have arisen in connexion with the draft resolution which is to be put to the vote presently. This is indeed unfortunate in view of the over-all significance of the denuclearization of Latin America which is such a welcome example to various regions, including our own continent of Africa.

140. It has been our policy for many years consistently to support, in this Committee and in the General Assembly, the principle of denuclearization as a necessary step in the direction of ensuring peace in our time. It was therefore with great attention that we followed the proceedings, when this item was brought up for discussion here in the Committee, and when the representative of Mexico introduced the draft resolution he made the correct remark, with which we agree, that the General Assembly has no competence to revise or amend international agreements concluded among States Members of this Organization.

141. The Ethiopian delegation is fully in agreement with the fundamental principles of the concept on which the observations of the representative of Mexico were founded. Yet we believe it to be equally true that the General Assembly should not be put in a position of having to endorse an international treaty—any international treaty—which is held by a Member State to be exclusionary, and hence discriminatory, vis-à-vis one particular State within the geographical area in which the provisions of the treaty are expected to apply.

142. The whole issue is, therefore, one of far-reaching consequence to the authority and competence of the Organization. While my Government has serious reservations on issues such as the one I have tried to point out, so fundamental as to involve the competence and authority of the Organization, in view of my country's dedication to the principle of denuclearization of the various regions of the world, my delegation is impelled to support the resolution and will therefore vote for its adoption. But we should like to put on record our grave reservations on the points that I have tried to raise in my explanatory statement this afternoon.

143. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): In principle we are in favour of denuclearization and therefore we cannot fail to welcome the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. We welcome also the intention, since expressed by the United Kingdom, to accede, under certain conditions, to both additional Protocols of the Treaty and we reiterate the hope that other nuclear Powers will eventually do likewise.

144. However, the fact that certain States are not eligible to sign the Treaty may diminish its efficacy. At the 1506th meeting of this Committee we noted this fact and expressed the hope that it would be remedied. We regret that it has not been possible to adjust this point. We realize that time was limited. There is also the question of peaceful nuclear explosions, which may require further study. We sincerely hope that these points will be satisfactorily cleared up and we congratulate all the parties to the Treaty for their success, under the able chairmanship of Ambassador García Robles of Mexico, in drafting the first denuclearization treaty in an inhabited area.

145. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom): In the statement made by my delegation on 26 October [1508th meeting] we welcomed the Treaty of Tlatelolco as a most important advance in disarmament negotiations. We pay tribute also to the efforts of those who worked in the Preparatory Commission and in the chancelleries of Latin America to make possible the conclusion of this treaty.

146. It gave my delegation great pleasure also to be able to announce that my Government is willing to sign both additional Protocols to the Treaty and will make arrangements to do so shortly in Mexico City.

147. My delegation fully supports the draft resolution before the Committee on this item and will vote for it. We wish to take this opportunity to express satisfaction with the insertion of the penultimate preambular paragraph in the draft resolution by the co-sponsors confirming that all States within the geographical area of the Treaty will be free to become contracting parties to the Treaty, and this without any restriction.

148. I would once again like to congratulate the co-sponsors of this resolution on the success of their efforts and to hope that steps will soon be taken so that the Treaty may enter into force for all the States concerned. We hope also that the agency for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America may be established as soon as possible.

149. I would not wish to end this short intervention without paying a deep and sincere tribute on the part of my

delegation to Ambassador García Robles of Mexico through whose devoted patience and imaginative efforts this historic Treaty has become possible.

150. Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) (*translated from French*): My delegation would have liked to be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Committee. The delegation of Mauritania commends the effort made and the contribution that the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America may well represent to the difficult task of seeking ways and means of preventing the total destruction of mankind. The Treaty constitutes an important step in this direction. If it were followed by other equally important steps, it could help to remove the serious threat inherent in the production, stockpiling and proliferation of nuclear weapons, and it awakens hopes which we trust will be realized.

151. My delegation's vote is dictated by serious misgivings concerning article 25, paragraph 2, of the Treaty, which has occasioned draft resolution A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2 now before the Committee. It seems to us that article 25, paragraph 2, embodies dangerous notions which the United Nations cannot endorse without doing violence to the basic principles of the Charter.

152. For this important reason, simply and solely, the delegation of Mauritania will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2.

153. Mr. ISINGOMA (Uganda): Before the vote is taken on this very important item in the field of disarmament, I should like to clarify the views of my delegation on the draft resolution concerning the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

154. In our intervention of 27 October [*1509th meeting*] when this Committee was considering this very item, my delegation warmly welcomed the Treaty. Those words of appreciation of the unique achievement of the Latin American countries were prompted by our sincere desire for general and complete disarmament, and particularly the prohibition of such weapons, which are potential dangers to mankind. My delegation was, however, surprised to note that the very Treaty which was welcomed by the Committee was subsequently found to contain a prohibitive article which bars an integral member State of the region and a State Member of this Organization from becoming a signatory to the Treaty. The endorsement of this Treaty by the General Assembly with that article of exclusion has many implications.

155. Delegations will recall the statement made by the representative of Guyana indicating the willingness of Guyana to be a signatory. While we appreciate the statesmanship of the Latin Americans and the way they have tried to find a solution to the problem, we still feel that there is room for improvement.

156. My delegation would have been pleased to see this draft resolution go through without much ado. Even though there are some outstanding disputes between the excluded member and other members signatory to the Treaty, a compromise formula might have been found as the Treaty was not in any way centred on the substance of the dispute. The barring of a member State in a region

might create a very bad precedent in the United Nations and other regions aiming at similar treaties.

157. Because of these serious misgivings particularly about article 25 of the Treaty, my delegation will abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

158. Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria): In the name of the Nigerian delegation I wish to explain briefly the vote that we propose to cast in respect of this draft resolution.

159. Our general position regarding the Treaty which is our subject-matter was, in the first place, clearly stated by our Commissioner for External Affairs in the general debate in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly. This was amplified by our spokesman when he made an earlier contribution to the debate in this Committee [*1508th meeting*]. I do not propose to go over what they have said.

160. Briefly, our position is one of commendation for our Latin American friends for the care and thoroughness with which they went about preparing and finalizing this Treaty. It is therefore a matter of considerable regret to us that the Treaty appears to provide for the deliberate exclusion of certain States on grounds which do no good even to those who are parties to the Treaty. We are, however, conscious of the effort made in the penultimate preambular paragraph of the draft resolution before us to meet this unfortunate defect in the Treaty. And yet we must in all honesty say that we had hoped that our Latin American friends could go further to meet the point of view that has been expressed by us and by other delegations in this Committee.

161. In the light of our general view of the situation, however, the Nigerian delegation cannot but vote for this draft resolution, and we shall do so. But we shall do so in the hope that our Latin American friends, whose good faith our experience in this Organization has taught us to accept, will in return take careful note of the reservations that we and others of their friends have expressed in regard to this Treaty and will do their utmost to ensure that the intent to which they have given expression in that penultimate preambular paragraph of this draft resolution will be translated into facts as soon as possible.

162. Mr. GHORBAL (United Arab Republic): I hope that it is not too late to add the words of the United Arab Republic in expressing appreciation of the purposes and principles contained in the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We had occasion this morning to indicate that we considered the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America a positive step on the road to general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

163. We consider the Treaty, together with other measures already taken—the Moscow Partial Test-Ban Treaty and the Treaty on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space—as partial measures each in its own sphere, yet all contributing to bringing us nearer to our final goal and destination. It is a Latin American instrument directed mainly to serve Latin America in the field of nuclear disarmament and, as a positive contribution to over-all nuclear disarmament, we salute it.

164. On the other hand, we cannot fail to state that we sympathize with the point raised by the representative of

Guyana. You, Mr. Chairman, like others in this Committee, had occasion to refer to the long and tireless efforts deployed to find a formula which would commend itself to all sides. In this respect we wish to pay particular tribute to Mr. García Robles of Mexico for his tireless efforts, even during week-ends, to help in finding the desired formula and in completing the Committee's work on this item.

165. While it has not been possible to achieve the solution desired, the United Arab Republic delegation listened with great interest and care to the statement made a short while ago by our colleague from Venezuela. He stated that it was not the intention of the Latin American States to exclude a peace-loving country like Guyana. He added that it was the intention of the signatories to the Treaty to render it universal. Taking his statement in conjunction with the additional paragraph inserted in the preamble to the draft resolution, we feel that it will not be long before the point raised by Guyana is duly met. For all these reasons, we shall vote for this resolution.

166. Mr. Hadj TOURE (Guinea) (*translated from French*): For the past two weeks, this Committee has been the scene of negotiations aimed at safeguarding the inner structure of a treaty which theoretically should be a very important and serious step in the direction of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. For in the absence of international control, the arms race removes all the safeguards for States anxious for protection against nuclear and thermonuclear war. It is only insofar as it is founded on the principle of universality that a treaty can serve the cause of mankind.

167. Although my delegation did not take part in the general debate on this question, I consider that a discriminatory clause should not be introduced into a text drafted for posterity and designed to safeguard the foundations of peace and security throughout the world.

168. It is unfortunate to find this in a treaty which is the first of its kind, which is an example to all the other continents and which is calculated to spur them on to set up nuclear weapon-free zones in all parts of the world and to satisfy men's longing to feel safe some day from the horrors of war.

169. The Organization of African Unity realizes that the African continent aspires to become a nuclear weapon-free zone. In response to that heartfelt wish the Republic of Guinea, while welcoming the gratifying initiative taken by the States of Latin America in concluding a denuclearization treaty, considers that a State belonging to a particular continent should not find itself the victim of a discriminatory clause. We sympathize with the concern expressed by the delegation of Guyana to be treated as an integral part of a continent and a people that want peace. Hence we hope that today's debate will be taken by our friends of Latin America as a pressing appeal to consider the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution as a text which will become effective immediately following the vote to be taken shortly, and as an example not only for Latin America but for all other parts of the world which are not yet denuclearized.

170. Consequently, while voting in favour of this draft resolution, my delegation makes express reservations on the

grounds that a discriminatory provision cannot in any circumstances be reconciled with the principle of universality, which is the very cornerstone of the work of the United Nations.

171. Mr. JOSEPH (Ceylon): In our statement on the debate on this item [*1510th meeting*], we welcomed the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. We consider it to be a laudable measure to contain the spread of nuclear weapons in the world. In our view it is a tremendous achievement that the countries of one continent should have agreed to exclude nuclear weapons from their territories, especially at a time when we are discussing a proposal for a ban on the use of nuclear weapons in the world.

172. We regret, however, that the signatories of the Treaty did not find it possible to include in the deliberations that led to the drafting and conclusion of the Treaty one of the sovereign States in the Latin American region whose policies they had no reason to regard as being inimical to their interests. Satisfactory reasons have not been given for what appears to be an unnecessarily discriminatory measure. We sincerely hope that any impediment that now exists to the admission of Guyana as a party to the Treaty will be removed with the least possible delay, especially as Guyana itself wishes to participate in the Treaty.

173. With that hope, we have decided to vote in the affirmative.

174. Mr. ILAKO (Kenya): My delegation welcomes the draft resolution put forward by the States of Latin America on the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. However, my delegation views with concern the fact that a member country of Latin America is precluded from signing the Treaty because of the exclusive nature of article 25 of that Treaty. Therefore, my delegation will abstain from voting.

175. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): In our statement at the 1510th meeting on 27 October we had expressed our profound gratification at the conclusion of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. The Latin American countries have worked hard to finalize this Treaty and we welcome it.

176. I have heard with great attention and sympathy the statement made today by the representative of Guyana, my good friend and colleague Ambassador Braithwaite. We recognize the force of logic and reasoning which underlie all his statements and the delegation of Guyana could rest assured that the delegation of India will always look at its problem with understanding and sympathy. In the informal talks that have taken place in the last few days my delegation has tried to be helpful.

177. My delegation has taken note of and appreciates the spirit which led the Latin American delegations to revise their draft resolution to include the new preambular paragraph. This new paragraph reads as follows:

"Noting that it is the intent of the signatory States that all existing States within the zone defined in the Treaty may become Parties to it without any restriction".

178. We are compelled to recognize the significance of the new preambular paragraph as it has originated with the sponsors of the draft resolution who were also signatories to this Treaty under discussion. In response to the legitimate doubts expressed by the delegation of Guyana, the co-sponsors of the draft have thus come forward with an assurance that their intention is not to exclude any State which may want to be a party to the Treaty. We realize that the delegation of Guyana continues to have reservations but we voice the hope that the coming months will help to resolve the situation which has arisen during the last few weeks. In the light of the above, my delegation will vote in favour of the revised draft resolution.

179. Mr. FAULKNER (Canada): I wish briefly to explain the favourable vote which my delegation will cast on the draft resolution before us now. In supporting this resolution welcoming a treaty which represents a unique achievement, I should wish to recall the remarks which I made at the 1506th meeting of this Committee on 25 October. I said then:

"We think it advantageous that the Treaty should be designed to embrace all sovereign States in the area, although we note that by virtue of article 25 and an associated resolution relating to territorial disputes, one State in the region and another potential one are at the moment barred from acceding to the Treaty." [1506th meeting, para. 4.]

180. In making that observation it was our hope—it is still our hope—that suitable steps would be taken to enable all the States in the region who wish to do so to accede to the Treaty. In this connexion, my delegation has been pleased to note the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution which reads as follows:

"Noting that it is the intent of the signatory States that all existing States within the zone defined in the Treaty may become Parties to it without any restriction".

181. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the last speaker on my list, the representative of Cuba, to explain his vote.

182. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation feels obliged to reaffirm its position on the proposal to make Latin America a denuclearized zone.

183. During the general debate [1508th meeting] we already expressed our sympathies with the intentions underlying this initiative and towards its leading exponent, the Government of Mexico. Nevertheless, ever since this proposal was first advanced, my Government has clearly stated its opinion concerning the only way of making it an effective instrument for the promotion of international peace and security.

184. We have steadily maintained that it is imperative to include the only nuclear Power of our hemisphere in a treaty of this kind. We have insisted particularly on the need for withdrawal of all the military bases established by the United States in Latin America, and first of all the many bases equipped with atomic or conventional weapons established in Puerto Rico, those in the Panama Canal Zone, and the one situated in the region of Guantanamo,

on the territory which the United States usurped from Cuba and continues to hold against the express will of the Cuban people.

185. The need to include the United States in a commitment of this nature in order to make it effective is obvious if we remember that the United States Government pursues an aggressive, warlike and interventionist policy in all parts of the world. That policy of the Washington Government is eloquently expressed in its criminal aggression against the Viet-Nameese people and by its military intervention in Santo Domingo in April 1965, carried out with the support of the Yankee bases in the Caribbean region. It is the firm conviction of my Government that, faced with the aggressive policy of imperialism, small nations have no effective guarantee, other than their own determination to resist and defend themselves. That is why the Revolutionary Government of Cuba has not signed and will not sign any international treaty on disarmament or measures connected with it as long as the present international situation persists and the aggressive designs of United States imperialism against our country continue. My Government will enter into no commitment which even theoretically limits its defensive capacity and will not, as a matter of principle, renounce its right to defend itself by all and any means it considers necessary.

186. For all these reasons my delegation abstained from participation in the activities which culminated in the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and those are also the grounds for our abstention with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2.

187. The CHAIRMAN: I give the floor to the representative of Mexico to make a short statement.

188. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): It would be most deplorable if the draft resolution we are about to vote on should be adversely affected by the emotions and passions understandably aroused in the States directly involved in a bilateral local dispute on a territorial question. But such a dispute seems to us completely out of place when we simply have to examine the significance and scope of a treaty of such pure and noble aims as the Treaty of Tlatelolco, or the even simpler and clearer ones of draft resolution A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2. This draft obviously does not demand that the General Assembly should approve the Treaty, but only that it should express satisfaction at the fact that the Latin American States found it possible to draw it up and adopt it, which is an entirely different matter from endorsing or accepting each and every one of its provisions.

189. Item 91 has appeared several times on our agenda; however, in view of the fact that the substantive discussion was concluded almost a month ago, at the 1511th meeting of the Committee held on 30 October, I feel it might be useful to recapitulate very briefly our debate on this subject.

190. As you will recall, in the course of seven meetings of the Committee—from the 1504th to the 1510th—the representatives of forty-five States expressed the highest praise for the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the principles inspiring it and the objectives it pursues.

191. At the 1531st meeting, held on the morning of Friday, 17 November, when, after a two-week recess, the Chairman announced that we would explain the votes on the joint draft resolution submitted by twenty Latin American States in document A/C.1/L.406/Rev.1, the delegation of Guyana unexpectedly asked that the debate should be postponed until Tuesday, 21 November.

192. At the 1533rd meeting, which took place on the date I have just mentioned, I had the honour to inform you that the recess granted by the Committee with the consent of all the sponsors of the joint draft had been spent by the sponsoring delegations in an attempt, with the participation of the representatives of Guyana, Jamaica and Barbados, to find a formula which would be satisfactory to all.

193. On that occasion I said that the spirit of complete understanding and receptivity shown by the representatives of the States sponsoring the draft had led to the inclusion in the revised text, which is the one the Committee now has before it in document A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2, of a new paragraph which appears as the penultimate paragraph of the preamble.

194. When I concluded my brief statement then, the representatives of some African States proposed a further postponement to permit consideration of the draft resolution, and again the sponsors agreed with the other members of the Committee in consenting to this suggestion.

195. At the 1535th meeting on the morning of Friday, 24 November it fell to my delegation, speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the revised draft, to request for the third time that the vote on it should be postponed to enable us to continue the active and uninterrupted consultations in which we had been engaged.

196. Finally, Mr. Chairman, you announced to the sponsors yesterday that, in the interest of the smooth progress of the work of the Committee and of the General Assembly itself, it had become necessary to set today's meeting as the deadline for proceeding to the vote on the joint draft. As was to be expected in view of the reasons mentioned, you obtained the immediate assent of the delegations sponsoring that draft.

197. There are a couple of points on which I should now like to add a few remarks. Firstly, I wish to stress that the draft resolution has undergone two revisions during which operative paragraph 3 was changed and a new paragraph was added which, as I mentioned previously, now appears as the penultimate paragraph of the preamble. The latter paragraph reads as follows: "*Noting* that it is the intent of the signatory States that all"—I repeat: "all"—"existing States within the zone defined in the Treaty may become parties to the Treaty without any restriction". Operative paragraph 3, which should obviously be interpreted in the light of the above preambular paragraph, reads: "*Recommends* States which are or may become signatories of the Treaty and those contemplated in Additional Protocol I of the Treaty to strive to take all the measures within their power to ensure that the Treaty speedily obtains the widest possible application among them".

198. Secondly, I should like to recall what I already said on another occasion with reference to the limitations

imposed on us by the fact that we are dealing with the text of a Treaty signed by the plenipotentiaries of sovereign States. Amendment is at present outside the competence not only of the delegations sponsoring the draft, but of the General Assembly itself.

199. Finally, I should like to read again what I stated on 21 November, as contained in the verbatim record of the 1533rd meeting held in the afternoon of that day, when, after observing that we should not be prevented from seeing the wood for the trees, I said:

"No doubt the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America is undoubtedly not a perfect instrument. But we must always remember that perfection is unattainable in human affairs. The Treaty is the result of the persevering efforts and good faith of a large group of sovereign States which have worked persistently and tirelessly for three years to make it possible for Latin America to be free of nuclear weapons for ever. Like any treaty, it is a legal and political instrument in whose preparation and adoption of which each and every one of the signatory States had to make concessions and give proof of a genuine spirit of conciliation. We are sure that there is not a single signatory State which would not have preferred a text different from that in the Treaty, at least with regard to some of its provisions. For that matter, we are equally certain that the same could be said of the supreme international instrument now in existence: the United Nations Charter.

"Nevertheless—and it is essential that we never forget this—the Treaty as a whole is one of the most valuable international instruments ever concluded in the field of disarmament. As the Secretary-General of the United Nations declared at the time, and as has been echoed here by the representatives of almost all of the 46 States which participated in the Committee's general debate on this question, the Treaty of Tlatelolco is the first example of unqualified prohibition of nuclear weapons in lands inhabited by man; it constitutes an event of historic significance in the world-wide effort to avoid the proliferation of and to call a halt to the nuclear weapons race; it marks an important milestone in the long and difficult search for disarmament; it is the first international instrument in this field to establish an effective control system under a permanent supervisory organ; and at the same time it sanctions the right to use nuclear energy for proved peaceful purposes in order to speed up the economic and social development of the peoples of the Contracting Parties." [1533rd meeting, paras. 8 and 9.]

200. My delegation hopes and trusts that it is this broad view, rather than that of imperfect details, which, I repeat, also abound in the United Nations Charter, that will inspire all the members of this Committee and of the General Assembly in casting their votes on the draft resolution submitted by the twenty Latin American States, including Mexico.

201. Before concluding, allow me to express my profound gratitude to all of you for your kind words concerning my country's contribution, and my own very modest personal one, to the preparatory work on this Treaty.

202. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the United States to exercise his right of reply.

203. Mr. THACHER (United States of America): Very briefly, my delegation rejects the allegations which were voiced by the representative of Cuba. Fortunately, there are few—indeed, there are very few—countries in the world that put forward false accusations as their rationale for rejecting all disarmament proposals.

204. We will support the resolution which is before the Committee in the belief that its adoption will assist in the attainment of the purposes which the sponsors of the resolution have in mind. We sincerely hope that by this action the Assembly will assist in the application of the Treaty to all countries in the zone.

205. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Cuba to exercise his right of reply.

206. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): I should like very briefly to express my surprise at the adjective “false” used by the representative of the United States in reference to the arguments I set forth concerning his country.

207. I doubt whether he is in a position to deny that there are United States military bases in Puerto Rico, and that two of them have atomic missile installations. I also doubt whether he is in a position to deny that there are United States military bases in the Panama Canal Zone, and one in the Guantanamo area. Besides, all these bases are mentioned in documents addressed by the United States delegation to the Preparatory Committee for the Treaty before us today.

208. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution sponsored by Argentina and nineteen other Latin American countries and contained in document A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Malaysia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Maldives Islands, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union

of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, Kenya.

The draft resolution was adopted by 79 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

209. The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on members who wish to explain the votes they have just cast.

210. Mr. JACKMAN (Barbados): As the Committee will have noted, the delegation of Barbados voted in favour of this resolution. However, my Government and its representatives have made no secret of the reservations they have in relation to article 25 of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and, as a matter of fact, the Prime Minister of Barbados, in his statement in the general debate [*1583rd plenary meeting*], while welcoming the initiative of the Latin American countries which presented the draft resolution to us in signing an exemplary Treaty, expressed the reservation that it appeared legally to tend to exclude from participation in the Treaty a country which is wholly within the geographical zone alluded to in the Treaty.

211. The delegation of Barbados took some part in the discussions which have taken place since the first remission of the debate, and reiterated those reservations. It has been possible for us to vote for this resolution because of the provision in the sixth preambular paragraph which, while admitting the discriminatory nature, by implication, of certain aspects of the Treaty, nevertheless notes that it is the intent of the signatory States that all existing States within the zone defined in the Treaty may become parties to it without any restriction.

212. My delegation feels certain that the signatories of this Treaty will in fact honour the spirit of the commitment which the sixth preambular paragraph represents.

213. Mr. DRISSI (Tunisia) (*translated from French*): In voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2, the delegation of Tunisia gave expression to its satisfaction with the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

214. We should like to pay a warm tribute to the head of the Mexican delegation for his valuable contribution towards bringing the Treaty to fruition.

215. We also congratulate all the States signatories of the Treaty.

216. My delegation, like others, is not happy about the matter of the exclusion of Guyana from this important Treaty, and it hopes that efforts will continue to be made to enable Guyana and all other States in the zone, without discrimination, to accede to the Treaty.

217. Mr. ZANDFARD (Iran): The adoption of resolution A/C.1/L.406/Rev.2, which received the support of my delegation, provides us with an opportunity to offer our congratulations to the countries of Latin America on their achievement in concluding a Treaty on the denuclearization of the region. The conclusion of the Treaty represents the

establishment of the first nuclear-free zone in an inhabited part of the world and in that sense is a pioneer step of great importance. The value of the Treaty lies in the fact that it aims at halting the spread of nuclear weapons in Latin America and, as the preamble to the Treaty rightly predicts, it will constitute

“... a significant contribution towards preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and a powerful factor for general and complete disarmament”.

218. By their wisdom and perseverance, the Latin Americans have proved clearly that the military denuclearization of a populated region is no longer a celebrated theory but is indeed a practical undertaking which could and should be emulated by others. The proceedings of the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America tell the story of how the intricacies of the problem were successfully tackled and the opposing views reconciled, and thus this impressive achievement brought about. The Treaty itself, being of an exceptional nature, establishes a number of precedents—precedents which could be useful in our search for application of the system of denuclearization in other regions of the world. I have in mind particularly the establishment under the Treaty of a system of verification and control under the auspices of a standing, permanent, supervisory organ, as well as the acceptance of the application of the safeguards provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

219. We voted for the draft resolution. In fact, we could not have voted otherwise since the nuclear disarmament of Latin America, a concept which my Government strongly upholds, was at stake. My delegation believes that those who were able to formulate such a remarkable legal framework for regional co-operation as the Treaty are able also to find a way to meet the point raised by the delegation of Guyana. By supporting the resolution which has just been adopted and explaining our vote we desire to identify ourselves with the great initiative taken by the Latin American countries in banning nuclear weapons from their region.

220. In conclusion, we hope that steps will soon be taken to see that the Treaty enters into force so that the lofty purpose of the Treaty of Tlatelolco may be fully realized.

221. Mr. McKEOWN (Australia): The Australian delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution. We believe that it is appropriate that the General Assembly should take this opportunity to welcome the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America concluded at Mexico City by a large number of Latin American countries, and we congratulate the countries concerned on their efforts.

222. We understood from the sponsors that the First Committee was not being asked to recommend that the General Assembly approve the detailed provisions of the Treaty. For that reason we agree with them that it was not appropriate that the Committee should attempt to interpret the Treaty, much less to reopen its provisions. Further, in adopting a position on this draft resolution, my delegation attached significance to the penultimate preambular paragraph:

“Noting that it is the intent of the signatory States that all existing States within the zone defined in the Treaty may become Parties to it without any restriction.”

223. Finally, the resolution which we have adopted relates only to the question of the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America. Its terms have no application to situations which exist in other areas. In these circumstances, it is sufficient for my delegation to reserve its position as regards any statements which might seek or have sought to draw wider implications from the resolution than are expressed in its terms.

224. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): In the general debate in the General Assembly [1584th plenary meeting] and also in this Committee [1510th meeting] my delegation has warmly welcomed the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and accordingly voted in favour of the resolution the Committee has just adopted. However, I wish to take this opportunity of assuring the delegate of Guyana that we listened with close interest to the statement he made at the beginning of the meeting this afternoon, and if we voted in favour of the draft resolution it was with the sincere hope that a mutual accommodation on the issues involved would soon be reached between the parties concerned, in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter.

225. It is also my delegation's hope that the efforts which have been initiated during the course of this debate in the First Committee will be continued and that such efforts, which are now reflected in the revised resolution which the Committee has adopted, especially the sixth preambular paragraph, will result in a fruitful and successful conclusion of the matter.

226. Mr. DEJAMMET (France) (*translated from French*): As indicated in our statement, the French delegation was not able to take a stand on the last two paragraphs of the draft resolution submitted to the Committee. They raise delicate problems—some of them of a legal and even constitutional nature—which in any event warrant careful and lengthy scrutiny on the part of my Government.

227. The other provisions of the draft resolution had our support, and we would gladly have voted in favour of them if a separate vote had been called for; but we appreciated the desire of the sponsors of the draft resolution to obtain a blanket vote on the text, and we did not wish to go against that feeling. Hence we abstained.

228. Mr. RAOUF (Iraq): In a statement before this Committee on 25 October last [1506th meeting] my delegation welcomed the conclusion of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. We did that, and we voted for the adoption of the draft resolution in spite of some uneasiness which we felt with regard to certain provisions of the Treaty. Our affirmative vote should therefore be seen in the light of the statement made a short time ago by Ambassador García Robles, the representative of Mexico, that an affirmative vote on the draft resolution would only be an endorsement of the lofty objectives of the Treaty and an appreciation of the efforts made to accomplish it and would not necessarily constitute an endorsement of all the provisions of the Treaty.

229. The CHAIRMAN: I have no more names on my list for explanations of vote.

230. Before concluding consideration of this item I should like to express my congratulations to the delegations of the Latin American countries on the felicitous conclusion of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. I should like in particular to congratulate Ambassador García Robles, who, as we all know, has played a very important and dynamic role in the deliberations that resulted in the conclusion of the Treaty which, I am sure, will help in strengthening peace and security in Latin

America. A Treaty of such historical significance will, I am sure, serve as an encouraging impetus to be followed in other areas of our planet.

231. I now declare that the Committee has concluded consideration of item 91, Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.